

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 23, 2006, in the nature of a requirement for restriction, has been carefully reviewed. This response is timely filed as April 23, 2006, was a Sunday. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Restriction has been required among what the Examiner considers to be patentably distinct species of the invention, as follows:

Group I, drawn to establishing a connection between a first primary storage system and a second storage system, presently comprising claims 1-10, 16-25 and 31-40; and

Group II, drawn to a protocol that supports devices that store variable-size records in a data frame, presently comprising claims 11-15, 26-30 and 41-45.

Applicant hereby elects Group I, claims 1-10, 16-25 and 31-40.

If this restriction requirement is maintained, it will be clear on the record that the PTO considers the groups to be patentably distinct from one another *i.e., prima facie non-obvious* from one another. This means that a reference

Appn. No. 09/985,788  
Response dated April 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 23, 2006

identical to the one group would not render the other group  
*prima facie* obvious.

Favorable consideration and examination of all  
pending claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornbau

Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\C\colb\Gluck1\PTO\RestrictionRequirement24Apr06.doc